

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action,¹ the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide antecedent basis for claims 21, 32, and 48; rejected claims 1, 3-6, 9-11, 13-15, 18-21, 23, 25, 31, 32, 34, 36-38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,111,042 to Kikugawa ("Kikugawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,895 to Abecassis ("Abecassis"); rejected claims 2, 13, 24, 35, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikugawa in view of Abecassis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,424,997 to Buskirk, Jr. et al. ("Buskirk"); and rejected claims 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikugawa in view of Abecassis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,107,271 to Aoki et al. ("Aoki").

Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25-27, 31, 32, 34, 36-38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 46-48. Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-21, 23-29, 31, 32, 34-38, 40-44, and 46-48 would remain pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to the specification. The Office Action alleges that the specification "fail[s] to provide proper antecedent basis for . . . 'computer-readable medium' as in claims 21, 32, and 48." Page 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Fig. 3, for example, illustrates ROM 52, RAM 53, magnetic disk 62, optical disk 63, magneto-optical disk 64, and semiconductor memory 65. See ¶ 153. These devices are known in the art as various types of computer-readable storage media. Similarly, Figs. 4 and 6 illustrate ROM 72, RAM 73, and ROM 142, RAM 143, magnetic

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

disk 150, optical disk 151, magneto-optical disk 152, and semiconductor memory 153, respectively. Accordingly, the objection to the specification should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 9-11, 13-15, 18-21, 23, 25, 31, 32, 34, 36-38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikugawa in view of Abecassis.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an information search system comprising, among other features,

means for searching the accumulated television program information for television program information associated with the extracted interest word . . . ; and

means for sending the television program information identified by the search to the information processing apparatus.

Kikugawa and Abecassis, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the claimed means for searching and means for sending.

Kikugawa discloses, “an electronic bulletin board system, which communicates with a user computer via a network, and mediates information exchange therebetween by an electronic bulletin board function.” Abstract. However, in Kikugawa, “[w]hen the referred e-mail text has a notable word that satisfies a similar condition . . . , an appropriate URL for the notable word is set as a link destination. And the mail server sends the e-mail, to which the link destination is set, . . . to the e-mail address of the recipient.” Col. 8, ll. 16-24.

Thus, Kikugawa sends to the recipient an e-mail containing a URL link corresponding to the notable word. In contrast, amended claim 1 recites “searching the accumulated television program information for television program information

associated with the extracted interest word . . . [and] sending the television program information identified by the search to the information processing apparatus” (emphasis added).

Abecassis fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kikugawa. Abecassis discloses, “an automated system and method that furnishes viewers with individualized automated editing and retrieval capabilities over the contents and length of a variable content video program.” Col. 1, ll. 8-11. In Abecassis, “each segment [of a program] is analyzed as to subject matter and assigned the necessary keyword . . . [which] provides the capability for inhibiting the viewing of undesirable subject matter, or assisting in the retrieval of desirable subject matter.” Col. 7, ll. 8-11 and 16-18. Programs are played on a segment-by-segment basis in accordance with a user’s preferences. Col. 9, ll. 53-64; col. 13, ll. 13-21. Accordingly, Abecassis also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed means for searching and means for sending.

Amended independent claims 11, 21, 23, 31, 32, 34, 41, 47, and 48, though of different scope than claim 1, are allowable over Kikugawa and Abecassis for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 3-6, 9, 10, 13-15, 18, 19, 25, 36-38, 40, 43, 44, and 46 are allowable at least because of their dependence from one of independent claims 1, 11, 23, 34, and 41.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2, 13, 24, 35, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikugawa in view of Abecassis, and further in view of Buskirk.

Claims 2, 13, 24, 35, and 42 are allowable over Kikugawa and Abecassis at least because of their dependence from one of independent claims 1, 11, 23, 34, and 41.

Buskirk discloses a system for “analyzing the electronic message by tokenization of the text, morphological analysis of the text . . . [and] determin[ing] the appropriate action or actions to effect on the message” (Abstract), but fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kikugawa and Abecassis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikugawa in view of Abecassis, and further in view of Aoki.

Claims 26-29 are allowable over Kikugawa and Abecassis at least because of their dependence from independent claim 23. Aoki discloses a system which “recommends programs to the user by “[referring] to the usage history contained in the user preference database DB108 to extract a keyword common to the programs that the user preferred” (Col. 6, ll. 47-50), but fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kikugawa and Abecassis.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 to allow Applicant to place the application in condition for allowance or, in the alternative, to place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 19, 2008

By: /Michael R. Kelly/
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921